

## REMARKS

Filed concurrently herewith is a request for a two month extension of time which extends the shortened statutory period for response to March 6, 2006. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed under the next business day rule.

The Official Action dated October 5, 2005 has been received in its contents carefully noted. In view thereof, Claims 3 and 13 had been canceled in their entirety without prejudice nor disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein, while Claim 1 has been amended in order to better define that which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 14 are presently pending in the instant application.

Initially, Applicant wishes to acknowledge the Examiner's indication on page 6 of the Office Action that Claims 5, 10, 12 and 14 are allowable over the prior art of record, while Claim 3 has been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of base claim and any intervening claims. In this regard, as can be seen in the foregoing amendments, independent Claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter previous dependent Claim 3. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 as amended as well as those claims which depend therefrom are now in proper condition for allowance.

With respect to the Office Action summary, it is noted that the Examiner has indicated that Claim 6 has been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. In this regard, with the allowance of independent Claim 1, it is respectfully requested that dependent Claim 6 which is indirectly dependent upon independent Claim 1 be reinstated and allowed as well.

Further, it is noted from the Office Action summary that Claims 7 and 8 have also been indicated as being allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, in that each of these claims directly dependent upon independent Claim 5 which has been indicated as being

allowable at the prior of record, it is respectfully requested that these claims likewise be allowed when passing the application to issue.

With reference now to paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner's indication that the election requirement set forth in the Office Action dated June 24, 2005 is noted. Further, in view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the instant application are in proper condition for allowance in that generic independent claims 1, 5 and 14 have been indicated as being allowable.

With respect to paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the title of the invention is not descriptive and a new title is required that it is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. As can be seen from the foregoing amendments, the title has been amended to recite a "Semiconductor Device Including First and Second Transistor Groups and Semiconductor Integrated Circuit Device" which is believed to be more indicative of applicant's claim invention. Should the examiner believe a more suitable title is appropriate, he is hereby invited to suggest such title.

With reference to paragraphs 4, 5, 7 and 8 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 4 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) to be as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,157,065 issued to Wong et al., claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) to be as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,365,941 issued to Rhee, claim 2 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhee in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhee in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0179057 issued to Tago et al. Each of these rejections are respectfully traversed in that the patents to Wong et al. or Rhee et al. when taking alone or in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art or Tag et al. failed to disclose or remotely suggest that which presently set forth in applicant's claimed invention.

Again, as can be seen for the foregoing amendments, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of previous dependent claim 3 which has been indicated as being allowable over the prior art of record by the Examiner. Accordingly, with the cancellation of Claim 13, it is respectfully submitted that each of independent claims 1, 5 and 14 are allowable at a prior of record along with dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 9 and 11 which depend from independent claim 1 and dependent claims 7, 8, 10 and 12 which are dependent from independent claim 5 are allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 14 are now in proper condition for allowance.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the objections and rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the examiner, that Claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 14 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution of the instant application he is hereby invited to a telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Donald R. Studebaker  
Reg. No. 32,815

Nixon Peabody LLP  
401 9<sup>th</sup> Street N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, D. C. 20004  
(202) 585-8000